



| NJ Ecosystem Evaluator Survey |
|-------------------------------|
| Background and Narrative      |
|                               |
| 1. Reviewer Name              |
| 2. STEM Ecosystem Name        |
|                               |

- How would you score the applicant's current status of their community's STEM Learning Ecosystem?
  - Applicant's evidence of diverse stakeholders representing a variety of settings.
  - Applicant's experience with and knowledge of current collaborative programs in their community.
  - Applicant illustrates shared vision and/or goals.
  - Applicant's experience with design principles.
  - Applicant's outlining of key leaders, including their individual and organization capacity.
  - Applicant's experience with content experts and STEM expertise.
  - Applicant's experience with cross-sector collaboration.

| Very Poor | Poor | Fair | Good | Very Good |
|-----------|------|------|------|-----------|
|           |      |      |      |           |

| <ul> <li>Applicant's assessment of opportunities</li> <li>Applicant's approach to addressing idented design and cultivation of their STEM Least Applicant's approach to anticipating characters and the control of their stems of their</li></ul> |
|--|
| <ul> <li>Applicant's assessment of opportunities</li> <li>Applicant's approach to addressing idented design and cultivation of their STEM Least Applicant's approach to anticipating characteristics.</li> <li>Very Poor Poor Fair</li> </ul>  |
| <ul> <li>Applicant's approach to addressing identication and cultivation of their STEM Least Applicant's approach to anticipating characteristics.</li> <li>Very Poor Poor Fair</li> </ul>   |
| design and cultivation of their STEM Lease.  • Applicant's approach to anticipating characteristics address those challenges.  Very Poor Poor Fair   |
| Applicant's approach to anticipating characteristics address those challenges.      Very Poor Poor Fair  |
| address those challenges.  Very Poor Poor Fair  O O  |
| Very Poor Poor Fair  |
|  |
| . Notes/Comments   |
|  |
|  |
|  |



## NJ Ecosystem Evaluator Survey

### Strategy Reference (www.stemecosystems.org for more information)

Strategy #1: Robust cross-sector partnerships designed to realize a collective vision of STEM success for young people are key to cultivating a rich STEM learning ecosystem. Stakeholders in many communities are coming together in new ways to connect formally disparate efforts.

Strategy #2: STEM learning opportunities are everywhere. In a STEM Learning Ecosystem, those opportunities should be high-quality, universally accessible, youth-centered and connected so learners can deepen their skills and interests and tackle increasingly complex challenges over time.

Strategy #3: In a STEM Learning Ecosystem, educators, whether preK-16 teachers, out-of-school time/summer staff, experts

in informal STEM institutions or STEM professionals acting as mentors, increase their individual efficacy through highquality

relevant professional development, cross-sector experiences and sharing effective practices. Educators understand and respect the role of educators in other settings.

Strategy #4: In a STEM Learning Ecosystem, educators, pathways and opportunities for exploration enable young people to become engaged, knowledgeable and skilled in the STEM disciplines as they progress from childhood through adolescence and into early adulthood.

- 6. Strategy One: How would you score the applicant's planning for the components of Strategy One within the context of their community and the cultivation of a STEM Learning Ecosystem?
  - Applicant's ability to address Strategy One for the design and cultivation of the STEM Learning Ecosystem.
  - Applicant's current understanding of the core elements of Strategy
     One.
  - Applicant's proposed approach to their utilization of the technical assistance.
  - Applicant's proposed approach to their participation in the Community of Practice.

| Very Poor | Poor | Fair | Good | Very Good |
|-----------|------|------|------|-----------|
|           |      |      |      |           |
|           |      |      |      |           |
|           |      |      |      |           |
|           |      |      |      |           |
|           |      |      |      |           |
|           |      |      |      |           |
|           |      |      |      |           |
|           |      |      |      |           |
|           |      |      |      |           |
|           |      |      |      |           |
|           |      |      |      |           |
|           |      |      |      |           |
|           |      |      |      |           |
|           |      |      |      |           |
|           |      |      |      |           |
|           |      |      |      |           |
|           |      |      |      |           |

- 7. Additional Strategies: How would you score the applicant's description of the components of at least one additional strategy (#2-4) within the context of their community and cultivation of their STEM Learning Ecosystem?
  - Applicant's ability to address Strategies 2-4 for the design and cultivation of the STEM Learning Ecosystem.
  - Applicant's understanding of the key challenges in developing a STEM Learning Ecosystem, and how the challenges will be
  - addressed.
  - Applicant's current understanding of the core elements of Strategies
     2-4.
  - Applicant's proposed approach to their utilization of the technical assistance.
  - Applicant's proposed approach to their participation in the Community of Practice.



8. How would you score the applicant's current evaluation efforts or planning within the context of their community and of their STEM Learning Ecosystem? Note: We do not expect communities to have a current evaluation plan for the STEM Learning Ecosystem. We are trying to understand if their initial thinking in evaluation. Applicant's experience in current evaluation efforts. • Applicant's ability to identify partners for future evaluation planning. Applicant's ability to identify potential challenges. Very Poor Fair Good Very Good Poor 9. Notes/Comments





# NJ Ecosystem Evaluator Survey

# Self-Assessments, Partnerships, and Sustainability

Note: Applicants were asked to have at least four of their STEM Learning Ecosystem members submit a self-assessment. Our intent is to understand where the applicant and their members feel the status of the attributes and characteristics of a STEM Learning Ecosystem.

- Applicant's ability to garner diverse representation of submissions and the understanding of the community's needs and readiness to develop a robust STEM ecosystem.
- Self-assessments show promise or substance.
- Self-assessments represent diverse members of their STEM Learning Ecosystem.

| 10. | In revie | ewing  | the  | self-ass | sessme  | ents  | for | how | the | comn | nunity | has |
|-----|----------|--------|------|----------|---------|-------|-----|-----|-----|------|--------|-----|
| coa | lesced   | partne | ers, | overall  | they re | eveal | l:  |     |     |      |        |     |

| Alignment (similar trends in responses)  |
|--|
| A combination of alignment and division (no real trends, responses are somewhat diverse) |
| Division (responses are very diverse)  |
|  |
| 11. In reviewing the self-assessments for diverse representation, overall                |
| they reveal:   |
| Very diverse representation of ecosystem members   |
| Somewhat diverse representation of ecosystem members                                     |
| No diverse representation of ecosystem members   |
|  |

12. How would you score the collaboration among the different partners as described in the list, the roles identified, and the submitted letters of support?

We are looking for the identification of fellow STEM Learning Ecosystem Members and their initial thinking of roles and responsibilities.

- Applicant's ability to garner diverse representation of letters of support.
- Applicant's demonstrated collaboration with new and/or existing partners through the letters of support.
- Various partners' commitments and contributions to their STEM Learning Ecosystems.

Identified partners in the RFQ included (but are not limited to):

- Formal PreK-12 Learning: (schools and school systems);
- Out-of-School Learning: out-of-school time and/or summer learning provided by schools or community-based organizations where available, out-of-school focused intermediary organizations;
- STEM-expert organizations such as science centers, museums, corporations, non-profit organizations or professional associations;
- Business and industry;
- Post-secondary STEM and higher education;
- Local or regional public or private funders; and
- Parent organizations or strategies to include families.



| Note: We are lo   | ooking at their<br>t may impact t                  | e applicant's su<br>initial planning<br>he sustainabili<br>move forward. | g and anticipat<br>ty of their STE | ion of           |
|---|--|--|------------------------------------|------------------|
| Learning E  • Applicant's needs for the Applicant's experiment of | cosystem. responsivene he future. ability to antic | ess to their STE<br>cipate opportunctipate challengem.                   | EM Learning E                      | cosystem's<br>h. |
| Very Poor   | Poor   | Fair   | Good                               | Very Good        |
| . ,   |  |  |                                    |                  |
|   |  | stainability plar  | and the second second              |                  |





| NJ Ecosystem Evaluator Survey |  |
|-------------------------------|--|
|                               |  |
|                               |  |
|                               |  |
|                               |  |
|                               |  |
|                               |  |
|                               |  |
|                               |  |
|                               |  |
|                               |  |
|                               |  |
|                               |  |
|                               |  |
|                               |  |
|                               |  |
|                               |  |
|                               |  |
|                               |  |
|                               |  |
|                               |  |
|                               |  |
|                               |  |
|                               |  |

16. How would you recommend this application?

Note: Your recommendation of this application should be based upon your overall review of the application. Your recommendations will be shared with the final review team.

Highly Recommend to be Part of the Initiative: The application demonstrates the capacity to design and cultivate their STEM Learning Ecosystem. They have coalesced the right partners and have conducted a robust self-assessment. They demonstrate understanding of the strategies and how technical assistance and participation in the Community of Practice would benefit their community. The community would be an asset to the Community of Practice.

Possibly Recommend to Part of the Initiative: The application may demonstrate the capacity to design and cultivate their STEM Learning Ecosystem, coalesced the right partners, conducted a robust self-assessment, understand the strategies, and how technical assistance and participation in the Community of Practice would benefit their community, however, there were areas of weakness or challenges in their application that demonstrate their adequacy but not outstanding capacity or ingredients for the STEM Learning Ecosystem without some technical assistance.

Would not Recommend to be Part of the Initiative at this Time: The application has significant areas to improve overall.

| Highly Recommend | Possibly Recommend | Would Not Recommend |
|------------------|--------------------|---------------------|
|                  |                    |                     |
|                  |                    |                     |

| 17. In your opinion, what are the applicant's strengths and areas of growth? Are there other factors you |
|--|
| considered for your recommendations?   |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |